

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 16 and 21 are amended. Claims 1, 16 and 21 each recite a method of managing information technology (IT) computing support services and processes. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-25 are directed to statutory subject matter, in that each claim recites a method of producing a useful, concrete and tangible result. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-14 and 16-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bowman-Amuah (U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,773). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is amended to recite a "method of managing information technology (IT) computing support services and processes, the method comprising: defining each of the IT computing support services as one of a computing transaction and a change to a computing environment; defining each of the IT computing support processes as one of: an information delivery process for delivering computing transactions to end users; an

environment build process for delivering changes to a computing environment which delivers computing transactions; a process for finding and fixing service and process defects associated with the information delivery process; and a process for finding and fixing service and process defects associated with the environment build process; and using the defined processes and defined services to analyze the IT computing support services and IT computing support processes.” Claims 11 and 13 (dependent on claim 1) also are amended, for consistency with amended claim 1.

Bowman-Amuah discloses a development architecture framework for designing, implementing and maintaining an integrated development environment. It is apparent that the development environment of Bowman-Amuah, while disclosed as requiring the same attention as a similarly sized end-user execution environment, is different from an end-user execution environment (FIG. 2; col. 9, lines 32-44). The framework of Bowman-Amuah does not describe “...defining each of the IT computing support processes as one of: an information delivery process for delivering computing transactions to end users...” and thus does not anticipate the recitations of amended claim 1.

With reference to independent claim 16, the claim is amended to recite a “method of managing information technology (IT) computing support services and processes, the method comprising: defining each IT computing support service as one of a computing transaction and a change to a computing environment; defining each IT computing support process as one of: an information delivery process for delivering computing transactions to end users; an environment build process for delivering changes to a computing environment which delivers computing transactions; a process

for finding and fixing service and process defects associated with the information delivery process; and a process for finding and fixing service and process defects associated with the environment build process; and managing quality of the IT computing support processes defined as information delivery and environment build processes by performing the IT computing support processes defined as processes for finding and fixing service and process defects.”

As previously discussed with reference to claim 1, it is apparent that the development environment of Bowman-Amuah is different from an end-user execution environment (FIG. 2; col. 9, lines 32-44). Thus the framework of Bowman-Amuah does not describe “...defining each IT computing support process as one of: an information delivery process for delivering computing transactions to end users...” and thus does not anticipate the recitations of amended claim 16.

Independent claim 21 is amended to recite a method of managing information technology (IT) computing support services and processes. Amended claim 21 recites: “...defining each of one or more of the IT computing support processes as a portion of one of an information delivery process for delivering computing transactions to end users, an environment build process for delivering changes to a computing environment that delivers computing transactions, a process for finding and fixing service and process defects associated with the information delivery process, and a process for finding and fixing service and process defects associated with the environment build process; defining each of the IT computing support services as one of a computing transaction and a change to a computing environment; and managing the IT computing support processes and services, the managing performed using the one or more

defined portions.” Dependent claims 22-25 are amended for consistency with amended claim 21.

As previously discussed, it is apparent that the development environment of Bowman-Amuah is different from an end-user execution environment (FIG. 2; col. 9, lines 32-44). Thus the framework of Bowman-Amuah does not describe “...defining each of one or more of the IT computing support processes as a portion of one of an information delivery process for delivering computing transactions to end users,...” and thus does not anticipate the recitations of amended claim 21.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah (U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,773) as applied to claims 1-14 and 16-25 above. This rejection is respectfully traversed.


Claim 15 (dependent on claim 1) is amended to recite “...mapping components of a quality management standard to the defined processes; and implementing the quality management standard with reference to the mapped components.” It is admitted in the Office Action that Bowman-Amuah does not teach at least one computer support process as defined by the Information Technology Infrastructure Library taxonomy. Further, Bowman-Amuah does not teach the recitations of claim 15 as amended. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 as amended should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7521.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 21, 2007

By: 
Elizabeth D. Odell, Reg. No. 39,532

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

EDO/hr